DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 765 LI 002 654

TITLE	NYSILL (New York State Interlibrary Loan) Evaluation: Phase III, 1969.
INSTITUTION	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Div. of Library Development.
PUB DATE	[70]
NOTE	86p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Division of Library Development, New York State Library, 99 Washington Avenue, Albany, New York 12210
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Automation, Evaluation, *Interlibrary Loans, *Libraries, *Library Networks, *Library Services, State Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	Library Automation, *New York State Interlibrary Loan Network, NYSILL

ABSTRACT

This evaluation, prepared by the staff of the Bureau of Academic and Research Libraries of the Division of Library Development cf the New York State Library, analyzes the New York State Interlibrary Loan (NYSILL) system's performance in 1969, It reports on a detailed review of the whole NYSILL system as well as the two regional systems within it. It is primarily a statistical report describing and analyzing the volume of requests handled by the NYSILL system, the fill rates and elapsed time for filled requests, and an analysis of the "urgent" and the "direct" options incorporated during Phase II. There are brief statistical reports on the relative use of NYSILL by various types of patrons and by various types of libraries, and the report includes figures on types of subjects handled by NYSILL, forms of material handled, and the number and dispositicn of requests eligible for referral in the network. Costs have also been examined and are reported on, and a special section deals with the developing use of technology to automate the NYSILI system. The report includes some of the recommendations which arise from the statistical results. (Author/SC)

EDO 47765

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Edwin Berry

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

N Y S I L L

NEW YORK STATE INTERLIBRARY LOAN

EVALUATION: PHASE III

1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LI 002 654

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Division of Library Development
Albany, New York 12224

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of the University (with years when terms expire)

1984	Joseph W. McGovern, A.B., LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D., D.C.L., *Chancellor*	New York
1985	Everett J. Penny, B.C.S., D.C.S., *Vice Chancellor*	White Plains
1978	Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D.	Troy
1973	Charles W. Millard, Jr., A.B., LL.D., L.H.D.	Buffalo
1972	Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S., H.H.D.	Purchase
1975	Edward M. M. Warburg, B.S., L.H.D.	New York
1977	Joseph T. King, LL.B.	Queens
1974	Joseph C. Indelicato, M.D.	Brooklyn
1976	Mrs. Helen B. Power, A.B., Litt.D., L.H.D.	Rochester
1979	Francis W. McGinley, B.S., LL.B., LL.D.	Glens Falls
1980	Max J. Rubin, LL.B., L.H.D.	New York
1971	Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., Litt.D.	Hastings on Hudson
1982	Stephen K. Bailey, A.B., B.A., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D.	Syracuse
1983	Harold E. Newcomb, B.A.	Owego
1981	Theodore M. Black, A.B.	Sands Point

President of the University and Commissioner of Education
Ewald B. Nyquist

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education
Gordon M. Ambach

Associate Commissioner for Cultural Education
John G. Broughton

Assistant Commissioner for Libraries
John A. Humphry

Director, Division of Library Development
Jean L. Connor

Director of State Library
Mason Tolman

Chief, Bureau of Academic and Research Libraries
E. J. Josey

Principal Librarian (Readers Services)
Robert B. Stewart

PREFACE

The American Council on Learned Societies report to the National Advisory Commission on Libraries stated that "research libraries undergird all libraries and that their effective functioning is essential to the advancement of knowledge in all fields and to the quality of education." The breadth and depth of knowledge in all fields of human endeavor have grown tremendously in this century. The increase in the quantity and variety of materials that are being published throughout the world has made it impossible for one library alone to satisfy the research needs of the advanced research library user. The New York State Interlibrary Loan network or NYSILL is designed to provide the researchers of New York State access to the major research and special library collections in the State. All nine of the subject referral libraries which support the NYSILL program are privately funded. They are compensated by the State to supply library materials to researchers in higher education, to business and industry, to the professions, and to other serious researchers who do not have these materials in their local libraries.

Recognition must be given also to the backstopping role of the three area referral libraries which fill general requests, thus avoiding an overload on the research libraries. Recognition of the critically important role of the State Library, which serves as the major resource and center of the network, must be given.

Thanks are extended to the staff of the 12 contractual NYSILL libraries, to the State Library staff, and to the staff of the Division of Electronic Data Processing, whose cooperative efforts have improved NYSILL in efficiency and service.

The monitoring of Phase III of NYSILL was the responsibility of the Bureau of Academic and Research Libraries, under whose aegis this report was prepared. Special commendation must be paid to Fay M. Blake, the NYSILL coordinator, and J. Van der Veer Judd, who has played an important role in the automation of NYSILL, for their meticulous research and the authorship of this report.

As we review the historical evolvement of the NYSILL network from its first year, in which requests numbered 46,000, to its third year of operation when 127,407 requests were processed, it is quite apparent that the research communities of New York State are turning increasingly to this State-compensated research informational network for materials which were heretofore unavailable to them.

Perhaps the fundamental factors in the increase in the quality of the NYSILL program can be attributed to the generous spirit and services of the NYSILL libraries, the general acceptance of the program by the creative researchers of the State, the support of the many librarians throughout the State engaged in reference and interlibrary loan work, and the diligence of State Library staff.

Though we claim a modicum of success in the strengthening and refinement of the program at this time, our ambition remains to make NYSILL the best possible network for advanced research library users.

Jean L. Connor
Director, Division of Library Development

Mason Tolman
Director of State Library

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE----------iii

Chapter 1 THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NYSILL NETWORK----------1

Chapter 2 THE NYSILL NETWORK: OCTOBER-DECEMBER, 1969---10

Chapter 3 COMPONENTS OF THE NYSILL NETWORK----------52

Chapter 4 NYSILL AND AUTOMATION----------63

RECOMMENDATIONS----------77

APPENDIX----------79

Chapter 1

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NYSILL NETWORK

In January 1967, the Division of Library Development and the New York State Library announced an experimental program, the New York State Interlibrary Loan (NYSILL). The new program, designed to give greater access to reference and research materials to all qualified New York residents, broke with a number of precedents. Interlibrary loans, practiced by American libraries for a century or more, had traditionally been a courtesy extended by one library to another. For the first time, State funds would be used to reimburse major libraries giving specialized interlibrary loan services. NYSILL also developed, for the first time, a regular contractual relationship among New York State libraries of all kinds--public, private, academic, and State. The NYSILL program thus made available to all qualified users in the State the vast resources of some of the great research libraries of New York State. The purpose for which NYSILL was established was stated to be the development of a unique instrument to serve the needs of the research community in New York State.

NYSILL - Phase I

The pilot project went into operation on March 22, 1967. Contracts were signed with three major public libraries (Brooklyn Public Library, Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, and the Monroe County Library System) and with eight private research libraries each responsible for specific subject areas (Columbia University, Cornell University,

Engineering Societies Library, Teachers College, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York Academy of Medicine, The New York Public Library Research Libraries, and Union Theological Seminary). In September 1967, a ninth subject referral library, New York University, was added. The New York State Library served as the hub of the network. Requests came to the State Library and were searched in its collection. If the State Library could not fill the request, it was referred to one of the area referral libraries and, if it could not be filled there, to one of the subject referral libraries. Teletype machines were installed in the State Library and in each of the referral libraries for rapid communication, but requests were accepted no matter how they were transmitted--by teletype, mail, phone, courier, and so forth.

Phase I of NYSILL ending in November 1967 was subjected to a searching review by contract with Nelson Associates in order to determine whether the experimental program warranted continuation. The first period, as might have been expected, presented a whole series of difficult problems, some predictable and others unexpected. Nelson Associates' report Evaluation of the New York State Library's NYSILL Pilot Program, issued in March 1968, revealed that about 46,000 requests had been received, mostly via teletype. The State Library was able to fill about 44 percent of the requests considered eligible for referral, and more than 11,000 requests were sent to the referral libraries. The overall volume was less than had been expected, the fill rate not spectacular, and the overall elapsed time between initiation of the request and receipt of the material averaged 22 days. The costs were somewhat staggering. Each referral library received a participation grant based on expected

volume and, in addition, a flat fee for each request searched and an additional fee for each request filled. Averages of the participation grants and the unit fees came to $15.80 for each filled request. There were other problems, too. Less than half of the requests came from academic users and many of those indicated dissatisfaction with NYSILL. Referral libraries complained of incorrect citations and inappropriate referrals. Everyone complained of the slowness of the system.

The difficulties during Phase I were severe, but the concept of NYSILL still seemed valid, so the program continued, as an experiment, during an interim period from November 1967 to July 1968. During this interim a series of meetings were arranged with librarians in the State at which NYSILL was discussed. As a result of the discussions several changes were instituted, and by July 1968 it had been decided to continue NYSILL for a second experimental phase. The major modifications were:

a) Permission was extended to academic libraries with collections of more than one million volumes to submit their requests directly to any of the subject referral libraries instead of through the State Library.

b) The contract with the Metropolitan Museum of Art was terminated.

c) A new contract was negotiated with the American Museum of Natural History.

d) The State Library precoded all requests eligible for referral so that when material was not available at a referral library it was sent directly to the next assigned referral library without having to be returned to the State Library for rereferral.

e) Contracts with referral libraries required them to report on the status of all requests within 5 days.

f) Additional teletype machines were installed in the State Library and in the referral libraries. Paper tape sending and receiving capability were added where lacking.

g) Medical requests could be tagged "urgent" for more rapid handling.

h) Two regional networks were established as part of NYSILL.

i) Some of the recordkeeping of the NYSILL network was automated with the installation of a computer in January 1969.

NYSILL - Phase II

From July 1968 through June 1969 the second phase of the NYSILL program continued to function with a review in depth, once more, by Nelson Associates of the now modified operation. In February 1969, Nelson Associates issued its report, Interlibrary Loan in New York State, covering NYSILL through the end of 1968. Substantial improvements were noted. Overall volume for 1968 had risen to 87,000 requests. Sixty-four percent of all the requests had been filled, and academic requests had risen in number as well as in number filled. The costs had been dramatically reduced to an average of $10.82 per filled request. Two of the modifications did not seem to lead to any great changes: the "urgent" option was only sparsely used and direct requests from academic libraries of a million or more volumes did not increase to any significant degree. Some problems persisted. Citations continued to be incorrect or incomplete too often; reports were still incorrect or misinterpreted in too many instances; and recordkeeping (before

automation) was spotty. The elapsed time for filling requests during Phase II was difficult to compare with Phase I. Changes in record-keeping made it possible to trace only the time between arrival of a request at the State Library and the time a report was submitted either by the State Library or by the referral library. But the Nelson Associates' report attempted to adjust the statistics available and found that there was no substantial difference between Phase I and Phase II, although there had been a slight drop from an average of 22 days to one of a bit over 18 days. The State Library itself showed internal improvement. A significant number of all requests were supplied, reported, or referred within 2 days.

With all of its difficulties, Phase II of NYSILL revealed beyond any reasonable doubt that the program was important, necessary, and no longer merely experimental. By the end of 1968, it was the single largest information service in the State and still growing. It was providing both traditional interlibrary loan service and new services which had never been available before, especially access to private resources which had always been restricted in the past. It was serving the research community with serious research materials, and this category of user and of material was increasing. Costs were down, fill rate was up, and elapsed time was improving, even though slowly.

Regional Systems

As NYSILL began Phase II of its operation, two experimental regional systems went into operation. Both were funded by the State and closely monitored in order to determine whether they substantially improved interlibrary loan service in their own regions. One of the systems was

based in Buffalo, the other in Rochester; and each differed from the other in design, although not in purpose. At Buffalo,the 3R's council headquarters receives all requests and routes them either to the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library or to the State University of New York at Buffalo. In the Rochester area, on the other hand, each library makes its own decision, sending requests either to the Monroe County Public Library System or to the University of Rochester. When neither of these can supply, the request is circulated among other libraries in the region before being submitted into the NYSILL system.

During the first 3 months of operation,the two regional networks each processed more than 2,000 requests. At Buffalo,74 percent,and at Rochester,87 percent of the requests were filled within the region at average costs for filled requests of $5.90 (at SUNY at Buffalo) and $4.02 (at the University of Rochester). Academic libraries submitted a high percentage of the requests in Buffalo, while at Rochester both academic and special libraries (especially the Xerox Corporation and Eastman Kodak) made extensive use of the regional system. In both systems it took an average of 10 days to fill a request. At Buffalo, a request begins to move more quickly (sometimes within an hour) because it is telephoned to the council headquarters, but Rochester takes up some of the slack by processing more quickly once the request arrives and by delivering more quickly through its delivery service. The conclusion drawn from the monitoring of the first months of operation was decidedly in favor of the contination of both regional networks. Despite the difference in design,both networks performed very well.

NYSILL - Phase III

As the contract period of Phase II was coming to an end, a new round of regional meetings began at which the Nelson Associates' report on Phase II was discussed and recommendations for change and improvement were elicited from librarians throughout the State. As a result of these meetings, NYSILL entered Phase III with few basic changes in the design but with a firm belief that it had now passed the experimental stage and should continue to be funded as a full-fledged operational information program. As a result of a conference with librarians of all the referral libraries in November 1969, subject responsibilities of the subject referral libraries were in most cases expanded and refined.

During Phase III of NYSILL, there was also a change in the referral patterns used by the State Library. In the early stages of the NYSILL operation, requests eligible for referral had been somewhat rigidly referred, after searching the State Library's own collection, first to an area referral library and then, if necessary, to a subject referral library. Two years of experience with the program made it evident that requests were served more rapidly if they were routed to a subject referral library or an area referral library at once on the basis of the type of material requested. The State Library has, therefore, been receiving each request and, when unable to fill it from its own collection, has referred it to the appropriate library according to a decision based on professional judgment. The result has been a noticeable drop in the number of inappropriate referrals, e.g., "popular" materials to research libraries or specialized research materials to public

libraries. The decision was made to continue exploring the relationships between NYSILL and other information networks, although concentration should be on further improvements in NYSILL. Still another round of meetings was planned, this time particularly with interlibrary loan librarians of academic libraries. Discussions have also been held with medical librarians, and meetings with special librarians are also planned. The meetings are intended to provide a continuing exchange between interlibrary loan librarians, on the one hand, and the Division of Library Development and the State Library, on the other, so that the NYSILL network continues to improve.

Objectives of the Present Study

Just as Phase I and Phase II of NYSILL were monitored and the monitoring results published, Phase III has also been studied closely. This time, however, the staff of the Bureau of Academic and Research Libraries of the Division of Library Development is itself analyzing NYSILL's performance during 1969. The present study reports on a detailed review of the whole NYSILL system as well as the two regional systems within it. It is primarily a statistical report describing and analyzing the volume of requests handled by the NYSILL system, the fill rates and elapsed time for filled requests, and an analysis of the "urgent" and the "direct" options incorporated during Phase II. There are brief statistical reports on the relative use of NYSILL by various types of patrons and by various types of libraries, and the report includes figures on types of subjects handled by NYSILL, forms of material handled (i.e. serial or monograph), and the number and

disposition of requests eligible for referral in the network. Costs have also been examined and are reported on, and a special section deals with the developing use of technology to automate the NYSILL system. The report includes some of the recommendations which arise from the statistical results. In general, this study attempts to compare Phase III of NYSILL with the findings during Phase I and Phase II.

Chapter 2

THE NYSILL NETWORK: OCTOBER-DECEMBER 1969

The volume of requests in the NYSILL network is continuing to grow. Due to the sheer magnitude of the undertaking,it appeared unreasonable to base an evaluation of the network upon an examination of the entire population of requests. Therefore, it was decided to limit the study in two ways: by time period and by number of requests examined within that period.

Overview

Initially,an overview of the year's activity in the entire network might be helpful. A year is taken as the State fiscal year, April through March. This "year" can be conveniently related to the budget cycle but requires the estimation of March activity since the report is prepared during that month. For the last several years, March has constituted 12 percent of the year's traffic, and the estimation was projected on this basis.

NYSILL requests can be grouped in three categories: those which came to the State Library by teletype, those which came to the State Library by mail, and bypass requests which went directly from one-million-volume academic libraries to subject referral libraries. Taking into account an estimate for March activity, the total number of NYSILL requests handled during the 1968-69 State fiscal

year is as follows:

Teletype requests	91,000
Mail requests[1]	32,000
Bypass requests	3,807
	126,807

In the first two categories,the State Library performs a clearing role before requests are relayed to the referral libraries. In this role,it filled 44.2 percent of teletype requests and 67.5 percent of mail requests. Besides the performance of its clearing function, there is added significance to these fill rates when related to the State Library's collection. The majority of teletype requests are from public libraries, while the majority of mail requests come from academic and special libraries.

Thirty-six percent of teletype requests and 14 percent of mail requests were referred to other libraries. When their fill rates are added to that of the State Library, an overall network fill rate of 68.12 percent is obtained. This percentage does not include the bypass requests; however, the fill rate on these was similar, 72.9 percent.

Sample Selection

With this overview,a better appreciation for the scope of the New York State Interlibrary Loan program and the magnitude of its analysis is possible. To conduct a realistic, indepth study of an effort of this size, with limited time and staff, required placing a restriction on the number of requests examined.

[1]This figure does not include mail requests from schools or prisons which cannot be considered as NYSILL requests.

First, it was decided to perform a detailed examination of only one calendar quarter. The months of October through December were chosen; in the past this period has been one of heavy although not heaviest usage. Furthermore, the October-December quarter has been used by the Nelson Associates in their annual monitoring of the last several NYSILL phases. Therefore, its use would make comparison with previous years considerably easier.

During these chosen months,there were 23,760 teletype requests received at the State Library and 10,379 NYSILL mail requests. To reduce this to a manageable size,a 10 percent sample of the teletype requests was selected. Detailed information on the mail requests is difficult to obtain, so in most cases they are represented only in summary form.

Since January 2, 1969, all referral and disposition records on the teletype requests have been available on magnetic tape as a by-product of the continuing automation of the network. A 10 percent linear sample was drawn from these tapes for the above months of October to December. Eligibility, patron status, request type, and Dewey numbers were not being maintained on the machine file. Therefore, the original of each request represented in the sample was manually looked up, the missing data was transcribed onto a punchcard, and these cards were used to update the file.

Data Display

To facilitate the organization and display of data,a 997-point, forms matrix was used. This is, in the present case, a computer-prepared device which makes possible the two-dimensional examination of characteristics. In other words, it permits the matching of pairs of characteristics to determine whether there is an interrelationship.

Sample Matrix

	P	PB	M	H	G[2]
eligible	446	20	244	31	28
ineligible	0	0	0	0	20
monograph	200	1	183	21	33
serial	247	19	64	10	15

The above chart is a matrix used for illustrative purposes only. There are characteristics listed in the first column and in the first line. To determine the relationship between "monograph" and report code "M" follow the monograph line across to column "M." There were,in this example,183 monograph requests with report code "M."

The display of NYSILL data involved 997 characteristics. Additional dimensions can be introduced by the machine summation of characteristics which can then be related to others. For instance, one could determine the number of student requests from the Suffolk Cooperative Library System which were filled by Cornell with photocopy in less than 5 days.

Sample Size

Taking a 10 percent sample of teletype requests resulted in a rough sample population of 2,376 requests. Of these, 203 were requests for film material from the Auxiliary Services collection and are therefore not NYSILL requests. The 203 film requests were subtracted leaving 2,173 requests to be studied. This number includes 144 mail

[2]Disposition codes are defined in the appendix.

requests submitted to the network through the State Library and excludes direct access option requests from one-million-volume academic libraries. These are treated separately, and in full, for their number is relatively small.

For the purpose of selecting the sample, October's request is defined as any request initiated during the month of October. This same definition applies to other months. Since it can take several days past the end of a month for all transactions to be completed, a count kept on a calendar basis would differ somewhat from records based on the month of request initiation. Therefore there may be discrepancies between referral library figures and those used for this study; however, over a period of months such differences should average out.

Characteristics Studied

Within the scope of the study it was not possible to study all possible characteristics of the sample. However, it was felt that the following points merited attention:

a) The number of requests in the network

b) Comparison of fill rates with previous years

c) The disposition of requests within the referral network by report code

d) Eligibility

e) Elapsed time

f) Subject distribution

g) Referral pattern

h) Direct access option

i) Cost within referral network

Number of Requests

As previously mentioned, the total number of requests in the network from April 1, 1969, to March 31, 1970, was 126,807. There were 91,000 requests which came to the State Library by teletype and 32,000 by mail; there were 3,807 bypass or direct option requests. Estimated figures for the month of March are included. During the past several years the number of requests received during March has varied but has constituted 12 percent of the year's total; therefore, the estimate was made on this basis. Since this proportion is subject to change, there is a possibility of error.

Comparison With the Last 2 Years

Of greater interest than the actual number of requests received is the comparison with previous years. Therefore, in Table 1 the 1969-70 traffic can be seen displayed beside that of 1968-69 and 1967-68. A small increase is reflected in every month except July and August. There is no evidence as to the cause of the dip in these 2 months, for they are outside the monitoring period. However, a shift in the user pattern toward greater academic usage was observed during the October to December period. If this shift began earlier in the year it might help account for a slight lessening of summer activity. It will be noted that during the monitoring period there are more requests listed than were in the report file. This is due

primarily to a number of infrequent teletype users of the network whose requests are kept in a miscellaneous category and not entered into the computer system.

The overall growth rate for teletype requests appears to be around 5 percent but is actually around 9.1 percent for, contrary to a statement in the previous evaluation, the 1968-69 figures include requests to Auxiliary Services. Film requests amounted to 11 percent of the 1968-69 total; during 1969-70 it was 8.6 percent; so this year's growth came to 9.1 percent. The number of film requests in the 1967-68 figures is unkown, though from the overall figures it looks as if a yearly growth rate of 9 percent is reasonable for teletype requests.

The comparison with previous years should be based not only on the number of requests received but also on the number filled by the State Library, the number referred, and the number filled by referral libraries. Table 2 displays,for teletype requests,overall performance of the network during each of its phases. You will notice that 65 percent of teletype requests are filled; when mail requests are added, the total requests filled increases to 68.12 percent.

Table 1

TELETYPE REQUESTS RECEIVED
AT THE STATE LIBRARY

	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
April	6,447	8,057	8,874
May	5,084	6,135	6,163
June	3,990	5,217	5,536
July	4,668	6,560	6,211
August	4,871	5,404	5,269
September	5,189	6,049	6,670
October	8,615	9,097	9,356
November	7,976	7,588	7,643
December	7,009	6,572	7,114
January	6,749	7,375	
February	9,332	8,648	28,517[a]
March	10,018	10,041	
Total	79,948	86,743	91,000

[a]Estimated

Table 2

COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS STUDIES:
NYSILL OUTCOMES (REFERRING AND FILLING)

Teletype Requests	Study: 1st NYSILL Report[a]	Phase II[a]	Phase III
(1) Percent of total filled by State Library	44	47	44
(2) Percent referred	26	32	36
(3) Percent filled of those referred	42	57	59
(4) (2) x (3) = Portion of total filled by referral libraries	11	18	21
(5) (1) + (4) = Overall portion filled	55	65	65

[a]From Interlibrary Loan in New York State. New York: Nelson Associates, Inc., 1969, p. 74.

Eligibility

Eligibility refers to whether a specific request is eligible for referral beyond the State Library into the referral portion of the NYSILL network. Eligibility, according to the NYSILL Manual,[3] is determined by the intent and purpose of the Reference and Research Library Resources program, a program to improve library services to the research community of the State. The type of material appropriate for referral is indicated by the nature of the referral libraries whose services are to serious inquirers in specialized subject areas. Certain types of materials are excluded; for example, ones that can not be safely mailed or ones which exceed 24 pages of photocopy. Since it is difficult to properly evaluate a request from a distance, the requesting library is expected to determine eligibility for referral. This determination is reviewed prior to referral. To indicate eligibility for referral the requesting library supplies:

a) An approximate Dewey classification number

b) Status of reader requesting material

S - Student

F - Faculty

P - Professional

O - Other

c) Verification

d) Useful bibliographic information

---

[3] NYSILL: The New York State Interlibrary Loan Network. Albany: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, New York State Library, 1968, IV p. 1.

As a general rule, requests are not referred unless this additional information has been supplied. The inclusion of this data permits the study of subject strengths of referral library collections and user patterns. The occasional absence of one or more of these fields from referred requests results in difficulties which will become apparent in the analysis. Of the 2,173 requests in the sample, 1,278 should have been eligible for referral. Unfortunately, improper coding on many resulted in their being declared "ineligible" for referral. In table 3,it is seen that 83 requests from the sample were only partly coded for referral and therefore declared "ineligible." These had a patron status indicated but lacked some other required element, probably the Dewey number. The greatest single block of these were coded with the patron status "other," which consists primarily of public library patrons who do not fit the other categories. Failure to properly code resulted in a loss of service for these public library patrons.

This is a serious problem which indicates the need to more fully familiarize interlibrary loan librarians with the needs of the system.

Table 3 displays the distribution of eligible requests by patron status and shows which are affected most by improperly coded requests. There should have been 1,278 requests eligible for referral, but only 1,219 are accounted for, indicating that others were missing patron status coding.

Table 3

ELIGIBILITY
DISTRIBUTION BY PATRON STATUS

Patron Status	Eligible		Ineligible		
0 (other)	346	30%	52	63%	
S (student)	372	33%	12	14%	
P (professional)	148	13%	8	10%	
F (faculty)	270	24%	11	13%	
Total	1,136		83		1,219

The existence of ineligible requests with patron status coding indicates requests that may have been improperly coded for referral and therefore declared "ineligible."

There were 1,278 requests eligible for referral. Of these, 142 either did not have a patron status indicated or were among the 83 improperly coded requests noted above.

Eligibility can also be examined from the standpoint of performance at the State Library. Table 4 shows disposition of eligible and ineligible requests according to their report codes at the State Library. For quick reference:

A Fill

B Fill by photocopy

K Referred

A full interpretation of recent codes can be found in the appendix.

There were 1,278 eligible requests, 856 were ineligible, and there were 39 without eligibility coding. Using only the figures from table 4, 59 percent of the requests in the sample were eligible for referral. Of these, 36 percent were referred with the rest being handled at the State Library. Thirty-seven percent of all eligible requests were filled at the State Library which relates to a 40 percent fill rate average in the referral network.[4] The overall fill rate for both eligible and ineligible requests at the State Library appears to be 41 percent; however, the total includes 144 eligible mail requests not filled at the State Library. The validity of the 41 percent figure is, therefore, affected since filled eligible mail requests do not show. Correcting this increases the fill rate to 44 percent.

---

[4]The 40 percent reflects failures in multiple referrals.

Table 4

ELIGIBILITY

DISTRIBUTION BY REPORT CODE
AT THE STATE LIBRARY

State Library Code	Eligible	Ineligible
A	296	335
B	182	71
C	1	73
D		31
F	17	9
GN		
J	2	
E	6	332
S		
K	174	5
KR		
Subtotal	1,278	856

TOTAL: 2,134

Seventy-seven percent of the requests represented in this chart were either filled at the State Library or referred.

Thirty-nine requests were missing an eligibility code.

Elapsed Time

The problem of elapsed time is one of great interest and is occasionally critical. There are three aspects to the picture with respect to teletype requests:

a) Time between receipt of request from patron and transmission to the State Library

b) Time from transmission of a request to the State Library to transmission of a final report to the requesting library

c) Time from receipt of report to receipt of materials

Aspects "a" and "c" are ones the State Library has no control over. "A" is a function of the organization of the requesting library or library system, while "c" generally depends on the mails. Because of the reduced scope of this study, neither of these aspects was investigated. However, during the monitoring period it was determined that it was the practice of the referral libraries to use first class for photocopy mail. Since the practice had been general for some time, the overall effect is unknown.

Section "b" involves communications, bibliographic searching, and photocopy, where appropriate. In this area there appear to be significant improvements during the year. The elapsed time factor is examined in three ways: by total days in the network, by patron status, and by referral library report code. Changes which have influenced time lapse include the imposition of a time limit on referral library action and automation of central recordkeeping for teletype requests. Under the provisions of contracts with referral libraries, the libraries

will not be compensated for searching or filling requests unless the final report is received in less than 5 days from date of transmission from the State Library. This provision, along with the ability of the computer to keep track of requests and demand reports if none are received in 5 days, has had a very real effect on time in the network.

To date,no use has been made of the nonpayment provisions of these contracts. However, since there are still several libraries which often take longer than 5 days, it appears as though some enforcement may be necessary. As a byproduct of the automation of central recordkeeping operations, the number of requests referred to and filled by each referral library is known as well as the time lapse for each transaction. These figures should be used as the basis of quarterly payments to the referral libraries starting with Phase IV.

The improvement can be seen by comparing table 5 with Nelson Associates' finding for the same aspect last year.[5] Nelson Associates indicated a time lapse of 2.02 days if only the State Library dealt with a request, 11.8 days if it went to one referral library, and 15.8 days if it went to a second referral library. Days in table 5 represent working days, and the count does not start until a request has been in the State Library for 24 hours. Therefore, the average number of days a request is in the network as a whole is actually 3.07 rather than 2.07, and the average number of days a referred request is in the network is 4.91. Using statistical methods to calculate the mean and

---

[5] Interlibrary Loan in New York State. New York: Nelson Associates, Inc., 1969, p. 122.

standard deviation from an assumed mean, a mean of 1.93 with a standard deviation of 2.498 is obtained. The difference between 2.07 and 1.93 is, for present purposes, insignificant. However, the size of the standard deviation points out the small number of requests unreported for a considerable number of days.

To illustrate the organization of the table, consider the sixth day. In the network as a whole a final report was sent on the sixth day for 40 requests. By the end of the sixth day 2,018 or 92.9 percent of the 2,173 requests had been reported on. A total of 796 were referred and 40 were reported on during the sixth day. By the end of the sixth day 642 or 80.7 percent of referred requests had been reported on. It must, of course, be remembered that the day counters do not start for 24 hours after receipt at the State Library, so we are actually dealing with 7 days in the example, not 6.

An effort was made to observe whether the time taken to clear a referral library was influenced by patron status. In the NYSILL network, all requests in a category are to be treated in the same way, regardless of patron status. An analysis of this time factor could reflect two things: the influence of a particular status and/or difficulty of material requested. The assumption was that material requested by professional or faculty patrons would generally be more difficult.

From table 6 it can be seen that there are only minor variations in the number of days required to clear a request from any of the patron types. This indicates that all requests are being treated in a similar manner and that the validity of the statement on difficulty or the effect of difficulty on time is uncertain.

Table 5

DAYS[a] IN NYSILL NETWORK

Days to Receipt of Report	Total Network			Referred Requests Only[b]		
	Number of Reports	Total Reported On	Percent of Total Reported On	Number of Reports	Total Reported On	Percent of Total Reported On
1	1604	1604	73.8	230	230	28.9
2	126	1730	79.6	126	356	44.7
3	106	1836	84.5	104	460	57.8
4	83	1919	88.3	83	543	68.2
5	59	1978	91.0	59	602	75.6
6	40	2018	92.9	40	642	80.7
7	42	2060	94.8	42	684	85.9
8	30	2090	96.2	30	714	89.7
9	26	2116	97.4	26	740	93.0
10	18	2134	98.2	18	758	95.2
11-15	37	2171	99.9	36	794	99.7
16-20	1	2172	99.95	1	795	99.9
20 +	1	2173	100.0	1	796	100.0
Average Days			2.07			3.91

[a]Working days

[b]Only 781 requests were referred. The figure 796 reflects the misuse of the report codes G and M which opened the way for multiple reports.

Table 6

ELAPSED TIME

DAYS IN SYSTEM BY PATRON STATUS

Days	Reports Per Day				Totals by Days
	O	S	P	F	
1	248	248	93	152	741
2	21	29	15	31	96
3	22	18	14	36	90
4	26	19	6	21	72
5	17	16	10	7	50
6	16	10	3	5	34
7	15	9	4	8	36
8	7	10	3	6	26
9	6	10	4	4	24
10	8	5	1	2	16
11-15	14	10	2	10	36
16-20			1		1
Gr-20		1			1
Total by Status	400	385	156	282	1223
Average days	2.80	2.62	2.56	2.70	2.69

Time lapse in the referral network can be further examined in relation to the report codes. A full explanation of report codes can be found in the appendix. In brief, they are:

G	Does not circulate
H	Owned but not available at time of request
M	Does not own
P	Filled
PB	Filled by photocopy

In table 7 an interesting pattern appears in the average number of days per report code. It takes 1.9 days to find that a library owns but does not circulate an item and 2 days to provide photocopy. Averages for the other codes are considerably higher, ranging to over 5 working days from transmission of the request to a referral library. These higher averages are deceptive for they mask multiple referrals. In the case of multiple referrals, the final report code is indicated as well as the time lapse from transmission to the first library of the series and report from the last. This is further explained by average time of about 2 days for most referral libraries.

Table 7

DAYS[a] IN REFERRAL NETWORK
BY REPORT CODE

Network Report Codes
Number of Items Per Day

Days to Report	G	H	M	P	PB	Total By Day
1	38	5	32	146	9	230
2	2	2	34	81	7	126
3	4	2	22	74	2	104
4	1	8	26	47	1	83
5		3	31	23	2	59
6	1	1	24	14		40
7		5	21	16		42
8	1		16	13		30
9		4	12	10		26
10	1		12	5		18
11-15	1		16	18		36
16-20			1			1
Gr-20			1			1
Average days	1.9	4.9	5.3	3.4	2.0	3.9
Total by Report Code	49	31	248	447	21	796[b]

[a]Working days to final report.

[b]There were only 781 requests. The code "G" was misused 20 times and the code "M" three times. This opens the way for multiple reports and accounts for the difference.

Referral Library Performance

So far the referral libraries have been dealt with as a block. Actually there are two types of referral libraries and several types of requests.

Subject referral libraries are libraries with major research collections in specific subject areas. They have contracted with the State Library to provide backup to the NYSILL network in these subject areas and are compensated for doing so.

Area referral libraries are public libraries with large, general collections which have similarly agreed to provide backup in the NYSILL network.

Early in the NYSILL experience, the network was designed to provide as much protection for the subject referral libraries as possible. Requests were cleared by the State Library and if not filled, they were sent to an area referral library which in turn forwarded requests still unfilled to a specified subject library.

This referral pattern has undergone change with time because it became evident that many requests for highly specialized materials were going to area referral libraries without much of a chance of being filled. Therefore, in its assignment of referral points the Interlibrary Loan Unit at the State Library is now considering whether a particular request is of a subject and level that a large public library could reasonably be expected to own. If a request is not for public library material, it is sent directly to a subject referral library when not

filled at the State Library. Because of the elimination of an unproductive referral, there has been a saving in time and cost for each of these requests.

Table 8 shows the disposition of requests by report code at each of the referral libraries. Table 9 examines performance on requests from public libraries and table 10 those from academic libraries, while table 11 treats mail requests. The percentage of requests filled of those sent to each of the libraries is indicated in table 8 as well as an overall performance indicator. Materials reported as not owned by the libraries constituted 44 percent of the total, those owned but not circulating 16 percent. There were 460 requests filled or 40.5 percent. This 41 percent is useful for it is a measure of the efficiency of this portion of the network to be matched in the years ahead. The total number of requests represented in this table reflects multiple referrals. Since only 781 requests were actually referred, the 460 fills give the referral portion of the network an overall fill rate of 59 percent.

The performance of the American Museum of Natural History is sketchy due to a program error in statistics gathering. Records are kept by National Union Catalog identification code. The code for the museum is NNM, and a transaction would be recorded as NNM-M, NNM-PB, and so forth. Difficulties arose because The New York Public Library's code is NN and there is a report code "M." Some of the reports from NNM were assigned by error to NN-M. The number of these transactions is known and subtracted from the NN reports; however, while the number

which should have been assigned to the American Museum of Natural History is known, the breakdown of this number by report code is not. Therefore, the 63 percent fill rate indicated for the museum was derived from performance during other quarters of the year.

Table 11 shows that 44 percent of mail requests reported on by referral libraries were filled. This percentage again reflects multiple referrals. The percentage filled of those referred is 49 percent.

Table 8

DISPOSITION OF REQUESTS
BY REFERRAL LIBRARIES[a]

	G	H	M	P	PB		Total "b"
Subject Referral Libraries							
American Museum of Natural History	0	0	34	0	0	63%	34
Columbia University	19	18	68	72	2	42%	179
Cornell University	8	7	29	108	0	71%	152
Engineering Societies Library	4	0	14	13	0	42%	31
New York Academy of Medicine	3	4	19	25	15	61%	66
The New York Public Library	9	9	14		94	75%	126
New York University	0	0	16	6	0	27%	22
Teachers College	0	1	9	10	1	52%	21
Union Theological Seminary	0	0	10	5	0	33%	15
Area Referral Libraries							
Brooklyn Public Library	13	27	102	48	0	25%	190
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	4	32	107	44	0	24%	187
Monroe County Library System	2	16	79	17	0	15%	114
TOTAL	62	114	501	348	112		1137

[a]Teletype and mail

[b]Forty and one half percent is the percentage of requests reported on which were filled. This reflects multiple referrals. Four hundred and sixty requests of the 781 referred were actually filled, or 58.8 percent.

Table 9

REQUESTS FROM PUBLIC LIBRARIES[a]
DISPOSITION BY REFERRAL LIBRARIES

	G	H	M	P	PB	Total
Subject Referral Libraries						
American Museum of Natural History[b]			7			7
Columbia University	4	8	25	29		66
Cornell University	3	2	8	24		37
Engineering Societies Library	2		5	3		10
New York Academy of Medicine		1	3	5	1	10
The New York Public Library	2	3	6	24		35
New York University			7			7
Teachers College			4	7	1	12
Union Theological Seminary			5	2		7
Subtotal	11	14	70	94	2	191
Area Referral Libraries						
Brooklyn Public Library	10	23	75	36		144
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	4	26	79	32		141
Monroe County Library System	2	16	75	15		108
Subtotal	16	65	229	83		393
TOTAL	27	79	299	177	2	584

[a]Not including mail requests
[b]See text for explanation

Table 10

REQUESTS FROM ACADEMIC LIBRARIES[a]
DISPOSITION BY REFERRAL LIBRARIES

	G	H	M	P	PB	Total
Subject Referral Libraries						
American Museum of Natural History[b]			17			17
Columbia University	9	7	25	31	1	73
Cornell University	2	3	12	54		71
Engineering Societies Library	1		6	5		12
New York Academy of Medicine		1	11	11	9	32
The New York Public Library	6	5	3	66		80
New York University			6	4		10
Teachers College		1	3	3		7
Union Theological Seminary			2	2		4
Subtotal	18	17	85	176	10	306
Area Referral Libraries						
Brooklyn Public Library	2	3	16	8		29
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library		6	22	9		37
Monroe County Library System			3	2		5
Subtotal	2	9	41	19		71
TOTAL	20	26	126	195	10	377

[a]Not including mail requests
[b]See text for explanation

Table 11

NYSILL MAIL REQUESTS REFERRED INTO
THE NETWORK AT THE STATE LIBRARY

	G	H	M	P	PB	
Subject Referral Libraries						
American Museum of Natural History			10			
Columbia University	6	3	18	12	1	
Cornell University	3	2	9	30		
Engineering Societies Library	1		5	8		
New York Academy of Medicine	3	2	5	9	5	
The New York Public Library	1	1	5		4	
New York University			3	2		
Teachers College			2			
Union Theological Seminary			3	1		
Area Referral Libraries						
Brooklyn Public Library	1		11	4		
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library			6	3		
Monroe County Library System			1			
TOTAL	14	8	78	69	10	179[a]

[a]The sample includes only 144 mail requests referred into the network by the State Library. The difference between 144 and 179 is due to multiple referrals.
The referral libraries filled 44.13 percent of requests reported on.

Patron Status and Report Code

An attempt is made in table 12 to relate performance at referral libraries, as indicated by report code, to patron status. There are some cases in which a patron status was not reported. A comparison with table 8 will show that these omissions did not significantly affect the proportion each code is of the total. Therefore, since there is a noticeable difference in performance for the various types of patrons, it is assumed that the omissions were in a relatively random fashion.

Since such factors as time lapse and willingness to loan are not noticeably affected by patron status, it is apparent that there is a real difference between the requests from the academic or research community and those from general public library patrons. The figures show that the collections in research libraries backstopping NYSILL are more likely to contain materials needed by the academic and research community than materials of a more general nature.

Table 12

DISPOSITION OF TELETYPE REQUESTS
BY
PATRON STATUS AND REPORT CODE

Patron Status	G	H	M	P		PB	% Filled	Sub-Total	% of Total
0 (other)	17	49	164	52%	84		27	314	33
S (student)	15	27	129	45%	108	5	40	284	29
P (professional)	5	8	57	43%	57	5	47	132	14
F (faculty)	10	18	81	35%	125	2	54%	236	24
Subtotal	47	102	431		374	12			
TOTAL								966[a]	
% OF TOTAL	5%	11%	45%		39%	1%			

[a] 781 requests were referred. The 966 reflects both multiple referrals and the absence of a patron status on some referred requests.

Subject Distribution

The ability to fill requests according to their subject has been a matter of considerable interest. Each referrable request is supposed to carry an approximate Dewey number which provides a very convenient approach to subject analysis. The Dewey classification was divided into 35 groups of numbers representing a subject breakdown which could be related to subject referral library responsibilities.

The results of subject analysis appear by report code in table 13. and by patron status in table 14. As can be seen in table 13, there is a considerable variation in the percentage of fill. This percentage was originally intended to show a probable fill rate in given subject areas and to permit detailed analysis of subject referral libraries work. In reality, these percentages are very rough, for in many of the groups the number of requests is far too small to present an accurate picture. Because of this difficulty, no attempt was made to examine the performance of specific libraries.

Table 14 shows the distribution, within group, by patron status. To see the effect of varying composition of requester status on the fill rates compare the makeup of any given group with the percentage that status is of the total. It is noted that 66.9 percent of the referred requests are coded as from students, faculty, or professional.

The tables summarize the available data and are displayed to give an idea of the scope of the information collected while indicating that many groups are so sparse that analysis would be meaningless.

With the coming introduction of a new teletype format, the Dewey number will appear on all teletype requests. It is therefore recommended that, for next year's monitoring, the sample be significantly increased so as to permit better subject analysis. The performance of the State Library should be included in this analysis.

Table 13

SUBJECT DISTRIBUTION[a]
REFERRED REQUESTS BY REPORT CODE

Dewey Group		G	H	M	P	PB	Total	% Filled
1	000-099	BREAKDOWN UNKNOWN					132	
2	100-129, 140-149, 160-199	1	6	10	6	2	25	32
3	130-139, 150-159		12	36	9	1	58	17
4	200-299		5	27	14	3	49	35
5	300-309, 360-369	1	7	24	12	3	47	32
6	320-339, 350-359, 380-389, 650-659	6	6	41	17	11	81	35
7	340-349	1	1	1	2		5	40
8	370-379		4	18	18		40	45
9	400-499	1	2	4	7	2	16	56
10	500-509			5	4		9	44
11	510-519, 310-319	1	2	2			5	0
12	520-539	1		5	5	1	12	50
13	540-549, 660-669	2	3	13	11	12	41	56
14	550-559	1	1	4	2		8	25
15	560-579, 590-599, 390-399	2	2	11	8	2	25	40
16	580-589, 630-639	1	5	10	10		26	38
17	610-619		4	24	19	7	54	48
18	600-609, 620-629, 670-699	4	3	20	11	5	43	37
19	640-649			4	2		6	33
20	700-799	7	9	6	12	2	36	39
21	780-789	2	1	5	1		9	11
22	790-799			4	1		5	20
23	800-829	1	12	29	25	1	69	38
24	830-839			2	6		8	75
25	840-879			7	8	6	21	67
26	880-899	1	1			1	3	33
27	900-919	2	4	18	6	1	31	23
28	920-929	1	4	8	2		15	13
29	930-939			1	3	1	5	
30	940-949	4	4	8	13	2	31	
31	950-959		1	3	10	1	15	
32	960-969	2		4	1		7	
33	970-979	1		14	8	1	24	
34	980-989				1	1	2	
35	990-999							
							993	
	Totals	42	99	369	254	66	830	
	Percent of Total	5.1	11.9	44.4	30.6	8.0	100	

[a]Excluding Dewey Group Number 1 (000-099)

Table 14

SUBJECT DISTRIBUTION BY PATRON STATUS[a]
(REFERRED REQUESTS)

Dewey Group		Pro-fessional	Fac-ulty	Student	Other	Total
1	000-099		BREAKDOWN UNKNOWN			132
2	100-129, 140-149, 160-199		4	15	8	27
3	130-139, 150-159		4	19	31	54
4	200-299	2	8	14	23	47
5	300-309, 360-369	4	10	23	20	57
6	320-339, 350-359, 380-389, 650-659	7	22	52	28	109
7	340-349		5	2	1	8
8	370-379	5	10	27	31	73
9	400-499	2	5	8	2	17
10	500-509	2	2	1	7	12
11	510-519, 310-319	1	2	3	2	8
12	520-539	6	6	3	1	16
13	540-549, 660-669	26	7	8	5	46
14	550-559	1	9	2	1	13
15	560-579, 590-599, 310-399	2	15	18	13	48
16	580-589, 630-639	7	4	2	21	34
17	610-619	27	11	34	21	93
18	600-609, 620-629, 670-699	18	5	12	21	56
19	640-649			1	7	8
20	700-779	1	3	14	29	47
21	780-789		2	3	3	8
22	790-799		2		4	6
23	800-829	4	22	25	20	71
24	830-839		4	3	1	8
25	840-879	1	11	9	4	25
26	880-899	1	1	1	1	4
27	900-919	1	12	9	14	36
28	920-929	6	4	7	12	29
29	930-939	1	4			5
30	940-949	1	10	11	5	27
31	950-959		3	4		9
32	960-969	2	1	2	1	6
33	970-979	4	9	20	14	47
34	980-989	1	1	2		4
35	990-999					
						1190
	Totals	113	220	354	301	1004
	Percent of Total	12.9	25.9	33.9	33.2	100

[a]Analysis is exclusive of Dewey Group 1 (000-099).

Direct Access

Academic libraries with collections of more than one million volumes have been given permission to bypass the State Library and send requests directly to subject referral libraries. During the past year, this option has been extended to include one nonacademic library, The Research Libraries of The New York Public Library.

Copies of all direct access requests are sent to the State Library, as are copies of reports on them. Examination of these requests indicates considerable growth in the year; however, the total is still small. During the entire year, the direct access option was used for 3,807 requests of which 2,775 were filled, giving a fill rate of 73 percent.

Table 15

DIRECT ACCESS

1969-70

	Number of Requests	Number of Requests Filled
April-June	718	527
July-September	901	654
October-December	919	669
January-March[a]	1,269	925
TOTAL	3,807	2,775

Fill Rate 72.9%

[a]The last quarter was estimated on the basis of its being traditionally about 1/3 of the year's load.

Urgent Option

Special handling of requests termed "urgent" by the medical profession was continued in Phase III. Requests coded as "urgent" are searched immediately upon receipt at the State Library and,if not filled, teletyped to the appropriate subject referral library where they are to receive similar treatment.

An evaluation of the urgent option is difficult for it is used infrequently, only two to three times a month. In speculating on its infrequent use,there are several points to explore. Is interlibrary loan an appropriate source of urgent information? Will improved communications speed delivery significantly? Materials requested on interlibrary loan are generally delivered by mail. Therefore, what is urgent? If the photocopy of an article is sent by first class mail,it could take a week or two to reach many parts of the State. Will improved communications make a difference? Use of the "urgent" code and special handling in the network could possibly save as much as 2 out of 3 days; however, in light of the delivery problem,this saving is not terribly significant.

If there is a need for really urgent information,it is probably being met through direct physician-to-physician contact in the scientific tradition.

It is recommended that the urgent option be cautiously expanded to include requests from faculty or business and industry which carry a deadline. It should be determined by the librarian submitting the request whether it really is urgent and whether the deadline is within a reasonable time, considering the delivery situation. Special handling will save only 1 to 2 days.

The use of the urgent option has significant implications for the network as a whole. Since the normal flow of work is interrupted for an urgent request, the abuse of this option could quickly bog down the entire network and greatly delay all requests. Therefore, while the urgent option should be cautiously expanded it must be carefully monitored to assure that the overall level of service through the network does not suffer.

Referral Cost

The New York State Interlibrary Loan program differs from many other networks in that the backstopping referral libraries are compensated for their participation. Compensation has served to open up a number of private research libraries to public use through interlibrary loan and has played an important role in meeting the informational needs of New York's research community. Compensation takes two forms, a participation grant to provide clerical support in the referral library and unit fees for services rendered. Table 16 shows the analysis of costs of referred requests based upon a prorated participation grant and fees paid for searching and filling requests. The costs were estimated by expanding the 10 percent sample 10 times to approximate the original population. A comparison with 1967 and 1968 figures[6] in table 17 shows a steady decline in unit cost of referred requests, though this year's drop proved small.

A networkwide average cost of $10.46 per referred request appears in table 16. However, there is a great deal of unevenness with a high

[6] Interlibrary Loan in New York State. New York: Nelson Associates, Inc., 1969, p. 131.

of ~~$26.67~~ 25.63 and low of $6.12. Variation in unit cost depends directly upon two factors, the total number of requests handled and the percentage filled. Since each library receives a participation grant independent of request volume and since this grant must be divided by the number of requests processed in determination of unit costs, the total number of requests is significant. The more requests, the smaller is the portion of cost contributed by this factor. The libraries are paid a fee for searching each request and an additional fee for filling the request. If a library, for example, were to fill only 20 percent of its requests, its cost efficiency would be very poor, because for every filled request it would be paid to search four additional requests. Keeping these factors in mind, refer to table 16 and observe the relationship between unit fees and averaged participation grant under "cost per unit filled." Libraries with a high average under participation grants had relatively few requests to average into their participation grants, while libraries with high unit fees had poor fill rates. This relationship is particularly evident in the case of the area referral libraries.

Part of the overall cost problem is the pattern of referral. During the past year an effort has been made to send requests for materials not likely to be satisfied at the area referral libraries directly to the appropriate subject referral libreries. This change in pattern resulted in some improvement in efficiency; however, this was offset by an increase in unproductive multiple referrals. Thirty-six and a half percent of all referred requests were filled on the first referral, an additional 7.5 percent were filled on the second referral, and only 1 percent were

filled on the third. Relating this to the entire sample, the first referral filled 19.8 percent, the second an additional 3.9 percent, and the third .55 percent. Since libraries are paid for each search, the third referral is expensive and not terribly productive.

It is recommended that the use of a third referral be severely restricted due to low probability of success and high cost.

It is to be emphasized that the cost figures are only for the referral portion of the network. For a complete picture,the cost at the State Library and costs of communication equipment would have to be added, as must be the total number of NYSILL requests. Only estimates of these costs are available; however, the total cost per request appears to be around $5.

In light of these cost figures,it should be noted that NYSILL was established to meet the needs for research level materials which local library facilities could not be expected to provide. The program does not absolve the academic and research institutions from the responsibility of building their own collections to the point where they can adequately meet both curriculum requirements and day-to-day needs. An analysis of academic library collections in New York State during 1968 indicates that 72 percent fail to meet minimum standards of the "Guidelines for Quality" State standards less stringent than those of the American Library Association. When an abnormally high number of requests for basic materials are submitted by a single institution, they ought to be examined and discussed with the requesting librarian. If an example of persistent and frequent abuse develops, it might be necessary to consider both restrictons on NYSILL access and action through the Bureau of College Evaluation.

Table 16

ESTIMATED COSTS OF FILLING REFERRED NYSILL REQUESTS
OCTOBER-DECEMBER 1969[a]

Referral Library	Payments from the State Library				Cost Per Unit Filled		
Subject Referral Libraries	Participation Grant	Fill Fees[b]	Search Fees[c]	Requests Filled	Unit Fees	Participation Grant Only	Total
American Museum of Natural History	$ 931	$ 212	$ 417	106	$ 5.93	$ 8.78	$14.81
Columbia University	2,660	1,656	4,826	828	7.81	2.00	11.16
Cornell University	2,660	2,648	4,667	1324	5.55	2.00	7.53
Engineering Societies Library	931	268	762	134	7.69	6.95	14.63
New York Academy of Medicine	931	928	1,910	464	3.65	2.00	6.12
The New York Public Library	2,660	3,408	5,620	1704	5.30	1.56	6.86
New York University	931	130	525	65	10.08	14.32	24.40
Teachers College	931	180	450	90	7.00	10.34	17.34
Union Theological Seminary	931	108	345	54	8.39	17.24	25.63
Area Referral Libraries							
Brooklyn Public Library	1,862	940	4,725	470	12.05	3.96	16.01
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	1,862	860	4,600	430	12.70	4.33	17.03
Monroe County Library System	1,862	380	2,825	190	16.87	9.80	26.67
Average Cost					$7.41	$3.27	$10.68

[a]Survey data expanded by 10 to approximate original volume.
[b]Referral libraries receive $2 for each request filled.
[c]Subject referral libraries receive $2.50 and area referral libraries $1 for each request searched.

ERRATA Please replace page 50 of *NYSILL Evaluation Phase Three 1969* with this page.

Table 16

ESTIMATED COSTS OF FILLING REFERRED NYSILL REQUESTS
OCTOBER-DECEMBER 1969[a]

Referral Library	Payments from the State Library				Cost Per Unit Filled		
Subject Referral Libraries	Participation Grant	Fill Fees[b]	Search Fees[c]	Requests Filled	Unit Fees	Participation Grant Only	Total
American Museum of Natural History	$ 931	$ 212	$ 417	106	$ 5.93	$ 8.78	$14.81
Columbia University	2,660	1,656	4,826	828	7.81	2.00	11.16
Cornell University	2,660	2,648	4,667	1,324	5.55	2.00	7.53
Engineering Societies Library	931	268	762	134	7.69	6.95	14.63
New York Academy of Medicine	931	928	1,910	464	3.65	2.00	6.12
The New York Public Library	2,660	3,408	5,620	1,704	5.30	1.56	6.86
New York University	931	130	525	65	10.08	14.32	24.40
Teachers College	931	180	450	90	7.00	10.34	17.34
Union Theological Seminary	931	108	345	54	8.39	17.24	25.63
Area Referral Libraries							
Brooklyn Public Library	1,862	940	1,896	470	6.03	3.96	9.99
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	1,862	860	2,064	430	6.80	4.33	11.13
Monroe County Library System	1,862	380	1,166	190	8.14	9.80	17.94
			Average Cost		$6.20	$3.26	$9.46

[a]Survey data expanded by 10 to approximate original volume.
[b]Referral libraries receive $2 for each request filled.
[c]Subject referral libraries receive $2.50 and area referral libraries $1 for each request searched.

ERRATA Please replace page 51 of *NYSILL Evaluation Phase Three 1969* with this page.

Table 17

COST PER UNIT FILLED[a]
IN REFERRAL NETWORK

	TOTAL
1967	$15.80
1968	10.82
1969	9.46*
Decrease	-1.36*
Percent of Decrease	-12.6*

[a]Includes unit fees and participation grants.

*Please make related corrections on pages 47 and 48.

ERRATA Please replace page 51 of *NYSILL Evaluation Phase Three 1969* with this page.

Table 17

COST PER UNIT FILLED[a]
IN REFERRAL NETWORK

TOTAL

1967	$15.80
1968	10.82
1969	9.46*
Decrease	-1.36*
Percent of Decrease	-12.6*

[a]Includes unit fees and participation grants.

*Please make related corrections on pages 47 and 48.

Table 17

COST PER UNIT FILLED[a]
IN REFERRAL NETWORK

TOTAL

1967	$ 15.80
1968	10.82
1969	10.68
Decrease	-.14
Percent Decrease	- .01

[a]Includes unit fees and participation grants.

Chapter 3

COMPONENTS OF THE NYSILL NETWORK

The Role of the State Library

The New York State Library is at the heart of the NYSILL network serving as a major supplier, as the switching center for referrals, as the monitor for reports from referral libraries, and as the mediator between transmitting and supplying libraries. The early stages of the NYSILL program tested the capability of the State Library for these complex functions, and analysis during Phase III of the program has made it obvious that the State Library has performed well at all levels. The collection of the State Library, including its general reference collection as well as its various special divisions (Education, Law, Medicine, Legislative Reference, Science, and Technology), is one of the important research collections of the State and the Nation. The New York State Library is, as a matter of fact, the only state library to be accepted as a member of the Association of Research Libraries. From its collection,the State Library was able to fill 44 percent out of a total of 126,807 NYSILL requests. The State Library supplied 41.1 percent of requests it received from academic users, a statistic which indicates that the State Library is serving as an important supplier of New York's research needs.

The developing technological capabilities of the State Library and its excellent staff contribute to its ability to determine patterns of referral and to monitor referred requests. The installation of a

Control Data Corporation computer by the State Department of Education has made it possible to receive reports on all referred requests in 5 days (or less), a significant factor in better communication among participating libraries. The reporting procedure has improved,to a discernible degree,the overall elapsed time for filling requests; however, as it was reported in the previous chapter, there remain two areas in which the State Library has no control: (1) the time between receipt of a request from a patron and transmission to the State Library and (2) the time from receipt of report to the actual delivery of materials requested. Until a dedicated delivery network is established independent of the vagaries of postal service, all interlibrary loan will remain agonizingly slow. Sophisticated teletype machines have also improved the State Library's ability to receive and to process rapidly a constantly increasing volume of NYSILL requests. But the success of a library operation of NYSILL's magnitude must ultimately depend upon the skill and ability of the human factor, and the State Library's professional and clerical staff have consistently found the ways to cope with a growing number of requests and to refer requests rapidly and appropriately.

Two problem areas which have persisted during Phase III are confusion or ambiguity about referral patterns and about reporting codes. Interlibrary loan librarians bridle when the State Library fails to refer requests to sites which have been painstakingly located. There are a variety of reasons which may make it unfeasible for requests to be referred to indicated locations. One of the constraints

on the routing of referrals is the contractual obligation of the subject referral libraries. Requests are, as far as possible, routed to the library with a responsibility for the particular subject area of the request. Another reason for referrals counter to the location cited in the request may be an accumulation of knowledge by the State Library staff from past experience. Despite bibliographical evidence to the contrary, past attempts may have proved that the material is not located at the library cited or, more frequently, does not circulate although it physically exists there.

Report symbols have led to ambiguous interpretations in the past. In response to an evident need the NYSILL report codes have been expanded to indicate more clearly precise reasons for failure to fill a request. The new codes are included in a revised NYSILL Manual to be published shortly.

The State Library is able and quite willing to check back on any transaction about which questions arise. In order to do so, however, the inquiry must include the transaction number of the particular request. Queries about requests which have not been adequately reported by the State Library should be submitted within a month to prevent the need for a time-consuming hunt through past records.

Referral libraries sometimes submit information about an unfilled request which could serve as useful guides to the originating library and its patron. While it was relatively simple for this

information to be transmitted during earlier phases of NYSILL, the development of automatic computerized responses created some difficulties. The possibilities for a continuing flow of communication between referral library and originating libraries via computer is now being explored.

One of the most vexing problems in the NYSILL network is the lack of a rapid delivery system. Since the inception of NYSILL, transmission libraries, referral libraries, and the State Library have all speeded up by a significant margin the number of days needed to search most requests, but the mail, during the same period, has become slower and more unpredictable even when not beset by strikes or slowdowns. The Division of Library Development has drafted a proposal for a dedicated NYSILL partial delivery service. During a 4-month monitored period NYSILL materials would be picked up and returned at assigned points in Albany, Poughkeepsie, Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Garden City. Based on the results of such an experiment, eventual expansion of the delivery service, west to Buffalo, is contemplated. The implementation of the proposal is, of course, entirely dependent on the availability of sufficient funds, and the Division of Library Development is exploring possible sources.

The Role of the Subject Referral Libraries

The nine subject referral libraries participating in the NYSILL program represent among them an incomparable research resource. The libraries of Columbia University, Cornell University, Engineering Societies Library, American Museum of Natural History, New York

Academy of Medicine, Teachers College, Union Theological Seminary, New York University, and The New York Public Library Research Libraries are repositories for research collections in almost every conceivable discipline and subject area. Each of the libraries has accepted prime responsibility for referred requests in specific subject areas based on searching analysis of the strengths in each of the collections. Of the requests referred to these libraries, they were able to fill 59 percent in 1969. This is not an insignificant percentage, but the question can legitimately arise: Why didn't the subject referral libraries with their tremendous resources do better?

One answer lies in the very nature of advanced research in the second half of the 20th century. The publications explosion, the international dimensions of scholarship, and the greater and greater refinement of every academic discipline have made it almost impossible for any library or even combination of libraries to supply the needs of all users. In addition, every research library has had to cope with tremendous increases in its own clientele as more of our population than ever before in our history moves beyond secondary education. The NYSILL requests referred to the subject referral libraries are the more difficult, the more esoteric, the more elusive, having already been sifted through the State Library's research collection, and, therefore, already present problems.

Another aspect of the referral library fill rate can be found in an assessment of the collections themselves. In the very first stages of NYSILL the fact was brought home that research libraries

have never had a fully adequate share of their institutional budgets and that, consequently, collection development would have to become an integral part of NYSILL's development. A legislative proposal for State funding for collection development was submitted, but, unfortunately, it was never enacted. The need for such funding is still with us, and this report again indicates statistically that gaps continue to exist even among the superb libraries participating in NYSILL.

Finally, there exist within the various subject referral libraries internal management problems which result in very different fill rates for each of the libraries. (See chapter 2.) Dispersal of a collection among various relatively autonomous campuses or departments can seriously affect the ability of the central library actually to deliver materials which do exist in the library's collection somewhere. Understaffing,which forces a participating library to use poorly trained searchers with a minimum of supervision,can result in a failure to find materials although they are really owned by the library. A single professor's reserve booklist can knock out for a whole semester a sizable collection of materials in a particular discipline.

There is almost no problem which massive transfusions of money would fail to solve, but library budget problems seem to be getting worse rather than better. Whether the improvement of the subject referral libraries' fill rate is an immediate prospect remains unclear.

The Role of the Area Referral Libraries

During Phase III of NYSILL, the role of the area referral libraries changed somewhat. Originally conceived of as first referrals, they have become the referral libraries, primarily for more popular materials. The change was based on a logical premise: that public libraries, even large public libraries, would be more likely to supply popular materials, the kind of materials which public libraries have always collected. Analysis of the fill rates of the three area referral libraries, however, has produced a puzzling result. The three libraries were able to fill only 22.4 percent of the requests sent to them. This result is even more puzzling when we observe that two of the area referral libraries, which serve an additional regional function, produce in this capacity a fill rate of 53.4 percent of requests referred to them. Why should the fill rate of the area referral libraries be so low? Why should the same library supply so much more in its regional than in its area role?

The answer seems to be twofold. Before the area referral library receives a request it has already been searched in at least two libraries, the public library in which it originates and the State Library. The simplest requests have, therefore, already been supplied before the area library receives the referred request. In addition, it would appear that so few of the requests referred are supplied because public libraries tend to collect more or less similar materials. If one public library does not own the material, it is relatively unlikely that another will. Because of the low fill rate,

costs for the three area referral libraries are quite high. When the participation grant and the unit fees are combined, the average cost for each filled request comes to $18.27. There are, obviously, aspects of the area referral library role in NYSILL which do not appear in a statistical study alone. A recommendation for an in-depth study of all three libraries and a careful review of the concept of the area referral library in the NYSILL program is definitely in order in preparation for the next phase of NYSILL.

The Role of the Regional Network

The two regional networks within NYSILL decisively exhibited their value to the program within a few months of their inception. An analysis of their operation during 1969 reemphasizes the original estimation. In the Buffalo network, Buffalo and Erie County Public Library received 5,962 requests and filled 2,814 or 47.1 percent, while the library of State University of New York at Buffalo received 4,974 requests and filled 2,099 or 43.9 percent. Costs for the university average $5.87 and for Buffalo and Erie County Public Library $6.28[7] per filled request.

[7]The $6.28 is determined by dividing the unit fees by the number of requests filled. No prorated amount of the participation grant to Buffalo and Erie County Public Library (B&ECPL) has been included, since it is assumed that the participation grant was used in toto for B&ECPL's role as an area referral library. The same procedure was followed in the Nelson Associates' report on Phase II of NYSILL. One difficulty in attempting to determine the actual cost of filled rate per item in the regional network stems from the fact that the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library and the Monroe County Library System serve dual roles as area referral centers and regional resource centers and, at the same time, only receive one participation grant to perform both roles. Hence, the low cost of the filled rate of the regional program is misleading.

During the last quarter of 1969, the western New York 3R's council which coordinates the regional network handled a total of 3,650 requests, and, of these, 2,063, or 59 percent, were filled within the region.

The Rochester regional network handled 9,040 requests during the first 9 months of 1969 and filled 6,346 or 70 percent within the region. There were 2,144 or 23.7 percent of the requests which came from academic libraries in the region, while 5,838, or 64.5 percent, originated in special libraries. The concentration of industry in the Rochester area has resulted in heavy demands for interlibrary loans from industrial and commercial libraries, a demand which the regional network has been able to serve very well. Of the requests filled within the region, the Monroe County Library System was able to satisfy 713, or 11.3 percent, while the University of Rochester supplied 5,320 during the first three quarters of 1969, or an impressive 83 percent. The requests served by the Monroe County Library System are reimbursed by the Rochester 3R's council. State reimbursements to the University of Rochester (including a prorated portion of the participation grant) result in an average cost per filled request of only $3.87.

Since both of the regional networks have performed so well, a very natural question arises: Should additional regional networks be established in other parts of the State? As a matter of fact, several regional interlibrary loan arrangements have recently sprung up, but all are experimental and none is reimbursed by the State or

considered part of NYSILL. These programs are difficult to evaluate since they are in early stages of development, but they will be reviewed and studied for performance, costs, and trends. At this stage, there are no plans for additional State-reimbursed regional interlibrary loan programs. The reluctance to expand regional networks within NYSILL stems from two reasons. One is the lamentable fact that, outside of Buffalo and Rochester with their very strong public and university libraries participating in NYSILL (Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, SUNY at Buffalo, Monroe County Library System, and the University of Rochester), none of the other regions has access to either university or public library resources which could as effectively back a regional service. The experimental programs in the North Country, South Central, and Long Island areas may disprove this hypothesis and may require an entirely new approach to the regional picture. The other reason for reluctance may be even more decisive, however. At this writing the budget picture is a murky one, and it is uncertain whether the Buffalo and Rochester interlibrary loan programs, successful as they have proved, will receive State funds for continuation.[8] It is absolutely certain that funds for additional regional programs will not be forthcoming this time around.

---

[8]As of April 1, 1970, the State legislature voted $85,000 for the continuation of the two regional NYSILL programs.

Summary

One of the most interesting revelations during the development of NYSILL has been the interdependence of the State Library, the referral libraries, the regional libraries, the public libraries, and the academic and research libraries. No single library, not even any single type of library, can adequately serve even its own clients, to say nothing of the statewide research needs of New York. NYSILL is attempting to coordinate and, by coordinating, to expand the library services of New York State. The statistical evidence amply substantiates the growing contribution to total library service which the NYSILL program is making.

Chapter 4

NYSILL AND AUTOMATION

In NYSILL's first phases,problems developed in the area of communications, recordkeeping, and referral methods.

Nelson Associates in their evaluation of Phase II recommended:

1. "Automation of the record-keeping and central operations functions of NYSILL should be implemented with all possible speed."
2. "A revised teletype format should be adopted for the transmission of all NYSILL requests."
3. The development of a subject thesaurus as a useful tool in routing requests and a necessary condition for automation of the referral process.

Recordkeeping

The recommendation on the automation of recordkeeping functions was a vote of confidence,for this was part of an overall plan for NYSILL automation adopted in July of 1968. It soon became apparent that the grand plan would have to be set aside,for the immediate need was for emergency first aid. The Interlibrary Loan Unit of the State Library was serving as a central control point for a steadily increasing volume of NYSILL requests against the background of static staffing levels. Immediate relief from many of the routine tasks associated with recordkeeping within the network had to be found if the program was to continue and grow.

Two approaches to mechanization of recordkeeping were studied. An outside firm or software house could be hired to do the job. The job could be done in-house by the Division of Electronic Data Processing in cooperation with the State Library. After careful evaluation, it was decided to do the job in-house because the people who would be involved were already familiar with many of the problems in the operation. Computers posed another difficulty, for dial-up on-line access was necessary and the machine then available in the Education Department did not possess remote terminal capability. A new computer was on order, but the job could not wait more than a year for its arrival; therefore, it was decided to utilize the General Electric Company's time-shared system in Schenectady. G.E.'s BASIC programming language was used in conjunction with a 35ASR teletype terminal on alternate TWX dataphone service.

The system was designed to keep track of requests submitted to the State Library by teletype as well as those submitted by mail and referred by teletype. At the time action at the State Library was completed, request identification numbers were put into the computer system with the approriate report codes. If a request was to be referred, the referral routing was also inputted. Reports from referral libraries were recorded on the machine file, and when the request was filled or the final referral library reported, the computer included the final report on the daily list of reports sent to the request transmission site.

During Phase III,the referral library contracts stipulated a report within 5 days. For the first time it became possible, as a direct result of the computer system, to follow up on any request remaining at a referral library for 5 days. This followup became a matter of standard operating procedure beginning with the introduction of the computer system January 2, 1969, and has resulted in a considerable improvement in service.

The time-shared system was not ideally suited to handling large files and was beset with both communications and programming problems. The pricing structure was such that it penalized users who maintained or accessed files. As a result of these factors,there was great interest in getting on the Education Department's new computer as soon as possible after its delivery.

The department received its Control Data Corporation 3300 computer on schedule, and the conversion from G.E. became operational on January 2, 1970. In conversion, the existing system was expanded to include the same types of data for the State Library as had been available previously only for the referral library. There had been plans for significant advances with the advent of the new computer but these soon became frustrated by problems with both terminal support software and the operating system.

One measure of the effectiveness of the automation efforts is the effect they had upon the Interlibrary Loan Unit. During 1969, the number of teletype requests increased by about 10 percent. In the past, overtime was worked during periods of heavy demand; however,

in spite of the increased load no overtime was necessary this year. While there were certainly still frantic moments, these seemed to be less frequent than in 1968. It therefore appears that the computer system helped relieve some of the pressure.

Communication

Communication within the present network is by teletype, mail, and telephone. There has been no noticeable change in patterns of mail or telephone use so this commentary will concentrate on teletype.

At the time automation began, a decision had to be made regarding the continued use of teletype equipment. Cost, compatibility, disruption of the network, and suitability to the task were among the factors considered. The department computer was acquired through the usual bid procedure and is therefore only partially under the control of the department. Because of the possibility of undesired changes in computers, it was felt that, for the present, terminal equipment must be compatible with any competitor's computer. To preserve the integrity of the network, the terminals must be capable of operation both with the computer and as a stand-alone communications device. The existing teletype machine not only filled these requirements but also could compete very favorably on a cost basis.

Up until this year, all teletype machines have been on TWX service. In order to utilize the State tielines and thus eliminate toll charges, the NYSILL machines of some public library systems and referral libraries were converted from TWX to data phone service. The result has been improved efficiency within the network. However, some disgruntlement developed due to resulting restrictions on use outside the network.

To further facilitate computer access the X-on/X-off feature, otherwise known as TD call, is being installed on all machines supported through the Division of Library Development.

Private institutions with teletype access to NYSILL will be asked to have this feature installed on their equipment within the next few months.

Evaluation

Design and operation of a system is only part of the picture. It is necessary to examine and evaluate the operation of both system and network on a regular basis in order to monitor performance and lay the groundwork for future planning. To a large extent, the present analysis was made possible by the existence of computer files which permitted examination of activity during the monitoring period and to a lesser depth during the entire year.

What Comes Next

Now that the "First Aid" system has operated for a year and has been completely reprogrammed in light of longer run needs, attention can again be given to the broader picture. Since portions of the original first and third phases have now been implemented, the entire plan must be rethought. There are restraints placed upon further development by manpower availability and both hardware and program difficulties. Taking these factors into account, it appears as though there are two additional steps which might be accomplished in the next 2 years:

a) Automatic referral and reporting:

Bibliographic data will be stored on computer files. The State Library will, after an unsuccessful search, assign referral routing manually, as at present. Once the routing is inputted, the computer will provide on request daily lists of requests to each of the referral libraries. The referral libraries will report on the requests to the State Library and not rerefer. The status of the request will be checked by the computer. If the request has been filled, a report will be prepared for the requesting library. If it has not, the bibliographic data will be transmitted to the next referral library on the routing. This process will continue until either the assigned routing list is exhausted or the request is filled.

This step will further centralize the recordkeeping while relieving the referral libraries of the responsibility for rereferral.

b) User Access:

During the second of these two phases, there is to be direct access to the computer files by the requesting libraries with teletype capability. The requesting site will submit its requests directly to computer files and receive reports on completed transactions.

Direct submission of bibliographic data to computer files will permit far more efficient manual searching of requests. At the present time, large numbers of alphabetical lists are received every day. Through the use of the new format and computer processing these lists will be combined into several pairs of lists each day. The pairs will consist of a list of monographs arranged by author and a list of serials arranged by serial title. This consolidation and sorting will help simplify the work of the Interlibrary Loan Unit.

Format

The success of both of these steps depends on the use of a format designed specifically for computer access. There are a number of existing interlibrary loan formats; however, these are primarily teletype formats and, therefore, fail to identify specific data elements. From the standpoint of computer handling, requests not only must be submitted in a consistent manner, but the elements which the computer is expected to manipulate must be identified.

Any decision on format must consider carefully the requirements of both manual operations and the system. The use of a format which satisfies system needs while adding significantly to the complexity of manual operations cannot be tolerated, especially where precise control of input is not possible.

The MARC II format was seriously considered in light of theoretical national compatibility at some point in the future. On examination MARC was turned down for the following reasons:

a) MARC is far more detailed than necessary in an interlibrary loan network.

b) The MARC Serials Format was not yet available in final form. The lack of a single, consistent format that could handle both serials and monographs would cause great difficulty in both system and network.

c) All coding must be done by teletype operators, with professional review or extensive edit checks. Our evidence indicates that experienced library clerks can do quite a

commendable job assigning most MARC coding. However, many teletype operators at remote locations are typists with no library experience and a high turnover rate.

d) The use of the MARC format, while considerably increasing the difficulty of input, lacks sufficient advantages to offset this added work.

e) As the sophistication of the format increases, the probability of error goes up substantially and the problems of training become more acute.

Eventually, the decision was made to continue the use of the existing NYSILL Teletype Format with whatever modifications proved necessary. This format is simple, flexible, and easy to learn and has proved adequate to the needs of the network over a period of several years.

Modifications involved the addition of simple tags for each of the major data fields, the formalization of verification and note fields, and the introduction of several new codes in the identification area. The excerpt beginning on page 72, from the recently published edition of the NYSILL manual, presents the newly-implemented format. Particular attention should be paid to the new "verification" field. During the past year, the lack of proper verification has become an increasingly serious problem within the NYSILL network. To encourage those with the ability to verify to do so, and those who cannot verify to provide the source of the citation, three options have been offered:

a) Provide the name and year of the bibliographic tool in which the citation was verified. (The use of the new ALA standard abbreviation for bibliographic tools will reduce confusion.)

b) Give the source of the citation.

c) Indicate by the code ZZ that neither a) nor b) are possible.

Should the verification field be completely ignored the request will automatically be ineligible for referral in the network beyond the State Library.

Training

Any change in format can be confusing to those most immediately affected; therefore, an extensive training program will be undertaken to assure understanding and cooperation. There will be three phases to this training:

a) Field visits by a team consisting of representatives of the Division of Library Development and the Division of Electronic Data Processing. It is hoped to reach the interlibrary loan librarian and the teletype operators of every NYSILL transmission site. There will be a detailed discussion of the format and practice on a teletype machine.

b) Computer-assisted instruction is to play an important role. The operators and interlibrary loan librarians will be able to test their understanding of the format by submitting practice requests to the computer for edit

checks which will point out errors and indicate the necessary corrective action.

c) There will be a practice period lasting for several months during which the normal daily requests will be submitted in the new format. These will be sampled frequently and run against the edit programs to ensure continued compliance with the format and to spot difficulties that may arise.

INPUT FORMAT[9]

NEW YORK STATE INTERLIBRARY LOAN NETWORK

Constant data in fixed fields

A. The following information must be provided for each request submitted:

1. System code: An alphabetic abbreviation of not more than four letters assigned by the State Library used to identify the institution transmitting the requests, e.g., CCLS, BPL, SUCP.

2. Month: A number representing the month of the year followed by a hyphen; i.e., 1-January, 3-March, 12-December.

3. Sequence of request: An item number, assigned serially to requests received during the month, beginning anew with 1, each month.

4. Borrowing library: An identification number, preceded by a hyphen, representing each agency for which a transmission site regularly submits requests. The Interlibrary Loan Section of the State Library should have a current list of these agencies for mailing purposes. The list should include the (1) name, (2)

[9]From New York State Interlibrary Loan Network; NYSILL manual. Albany: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Division of Library Development, 1970.

street address, (3) post office address, and (4) zip code of each agency; i.e.,

NCLS-3-103-(34) This 34 refers to:

Interlibrary Loan
Carthage Free Library
Carthage, New York 13619

Transmission points other than public library systems may find this element unnecessary.

5. Type of request: An initial as designated for each of the following:

M-Monograph
S-Serial
R-Subject Request

6. Eligibility of request for referral:

E-Eligible, i.e., to be referred to one or more NYSILL referral libraries if not supplied by the N.Y. State Library.

I-Ineligible, i.e., to be supplied by the N. Y. State Library, if possible, but not to be referred elsewhere.

7. Patron status:

S-Student (college and university)
F-Faculty (community college, college, and university)
I-Business and Industry (researcher in business and industrial firms)
P-Professional (e.g., physician, attorney, clergyman, writer, elementary or secondary school teacher, sculptor, etc.)
O-Other

8. Only the first three digits of the Dewey number will be used as illustrated on pp. 18-21, e.g., a chemistry journal - 540

B. Field Identification:

1. Tags are letters identifying portions of the format as explained below and summarized on page 17.

2. Field tags must always be preceded by an asterisk sign (*) and followed by two spaces.

3. All adjacent codes in a single field must be separated by a hyphen (-).

C. Examples:

1. Request identification field
   *R NCLS-3-103-34
   Tag R
   System NCLS
   Month 3-
   Request Number 103
   Library Number 34

2. Additional required Information
   *I M-E-S-973
   Tag I
   Request Type M
   Referral Eligibility E
   Patron Status S
   Dewey Number 973

Bibliographic data

A. Monographic request

1. *A Author. Use primary author. Full name where known, whether personal or corporate.

2. *T Title. Use brief title.

3. *P Publisher, place, and date. The place of publication should only be indicated when it, too, is felt to be essential in the identification of the book.

4. *VER Verification. Verification must be indicated in one of the following ways:

   (a) Title and year of bibliographic tool in which found, or
   (b) Source of citation, or
   (c) "Cannot verify" use symbol (ZZ)

   Should the verification field be completely ignored, the request will automatically be ineligible for referral beyond the State Library.

5. *N Notes. Include in the note field any useful information such as: series title, "This edition only," "photocopy," location symbols or any other information that will facilitate filling the request.

Address. The correct address should come at the end of the note field. All addresses should begin with the words: Interlibrary Loan.

B. Serial request

1. *S Serial Title
2. *V Volume and issue designation
3. *D Date (Month and issue designation). If there is no month, skip it.
   Example: (a) 1979, pp. 15-20
   (b) Spring 1968, pp. 79-102
4. *A Author of article
5. *T Title of article
6. *VER Verification. Verification must be indicated in one of the following ways:

(a) Title and year of bibliographic tool in which found, or
(b) Source of citation, or
(c) "Cannot verify" use symbol (ZZ)

Should the verification field be completely ignored, the request will automatically be ineligible for referral beyond the State Library.

7. *N Notes. Include in the note field any additional useful information such as series title, "This edition only," "photocopy," location, or any other information that will facilitate filling the request.

Address: The correct address should come at the end of the note field.

Control and vertical spacing

A. At the end of each request, hold down the control key and depress the letter "L."

1. If the request is ineligible for referral, put in 3 rub-outs.

2. If the request is eligible for referral, put in 20 rub-outs.

B. Return the line, and continue to the next request.

Sample requests

A. Monograph Coded for Referral

*R NCLS-3-103-34
*I M-E-S-973
*A KELLY, FRANK K.
*T THE FIGHT FOR THE WHITE HOUSE: THE STORY OF 1912
*P CROWELL, 1961
*VER NUC 58-62, V 24 P. 370
*N INTERLIBRARY LOAN
CARTHAGE FREE LIBRARY
CARTHAGE, N.Y. 13619

B. Serial Coded for Referral

*R RCLS-3-100-51
*I S-E-F-050
*S DISCOVERY (NEW HAVEN)
*V VOL. 3 (1)
*D 1967, P. 5-20
*A SIBLEY, C.G.
*T PROTEINS, HISTORY BOOK OF EVOLUTION
*VER BIO ABST. (V. 49 JULY-AUG 1968) (65117)
*N NIC, NNC NOT NEEDED AFTER 5/30/70
INTERLIBRARY LOAN
PALISADES FREE LIBRARY
OAK TREE ROAD
PALISADES, N.Y. 10964

C. Sample of Ineligible Request

*R SLS-3-505-41
*I M-I-O-371
*A PETER, LAWRENCE
*T PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING
*P MCGRAW, 1965
*VER BIP 1969 P. 1412

D. Summary of Tags

1. *R Request identification
2. *I Additional required Information
3. *A Author of book or article
4. *T Title of book or article
5. *P Publisher, place, and date
6. *S Serial title
7. *V Volume and issue, if any
8. *D Date, (Month, year, and pagination)
9. *VER Verification
10. *N Notes

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Relationships between NYSILL and the Biomedical Communications Network should be further defined.
2. Brochures describing the intent and functioning of NYSILL should be prepared for distribution to the general public, the academic libraries in the State, the medical profession, and special libraries in the State.
3. Develop procedures to allow for transmission of brief messages to clarify reports from the referral libraries to the requesting libraries.
4. Continue to press for State funds for the development of collections in the State Library and in the referral libraries.
5. Fund an indepth study by an outside agency of the area referral libraries to determine whether they should be continued in the NYSILL network design.
6. Press for State funds to continue both regional networks in Buffalo and in Rochester. Both of these networks should be monitored annually.
7. The State Library and the Division of Library Development should examine the probability of success resulting from multiple referrals on a quarterly basis. The referral patterns ought to be adjusted to reduce the large number of fruitless referrals.
8. There should be an examination of each referral library's performance in the subject areas for which it is responsible.
9. There should be a determination as to why requests are sent to subject referral libraries which are outside their area of responsibility.

10. Payments to NYSILL referral libraries should continue to be made upon the basis of a report and voucher submitted to the Division of Library Development; however, a periodic audit will be made on the basis of the computer generated reports.

APPENDIX

Report Codes

I. Request ineligible for referral in the network

Requests may be coded ineligible for referral in the NYSILL network by the originating library, the library transmitting the request, or the Interlibrary Loan Unit of the State Library. The State Library will attempt to fill these requests from its own collections. Reports on these transactions will be coded as follows:

Report Symbol	Meaning
A	Request filled from State Library's holdings and mailed. Transaction completed.
B	Photocopy sent by State Library. If the request was for original material and it was only possible to supply photocopy, the complete transaction will be reported B. It will not be used for requests for which the State Library customarily supplies photocopy. Transaction completed.
C	Not on shelves in State Library. Request again. This notation applies to materials not expected to be available within 30 days. Transaction completed.
D	Not on shelves in State Library. Reserved. This notation applies to materials in circulation. Transaction completed.
E	This notation applies to books which the State Library does not own. Transaction completed.
F	Inadequate citation. Requests canceled. Resubmit if more complete information is available.
GN	In State Library. Does not circulate. Transaction completed.

II. Requests eligible for referral in the network

Requests are coded eligible for referral in the NYSILL network by the library transmitting the request to the State Library. The Interlibrary

Loan Unit will also evaluate the suitability of these requests for referral. Reports on these transactions will be coded as follows:

Report Symbol	Meaning
A	Request filled from State Library's holdings and mailed. Transaction completed.
B	Photocopy sent by State Library. If the request was for original material and it was only possible to supply photocopy, the completed transaction will be reported B. It will not be used for requests for which the State Library customarily supplies photocopy. Transaction completed.
F	Inadequate citation. Request canceled. Resubmit if more complete information is available.
G	Does not circulate in area/subject centers. The code for the referral library at which the book does not circulate will follow the hyphen.
H	Material requested owned by referral library, but not available for circulation at time of request. The code for the referral site will follow the hyphen.
J	Request considered ineligible for further referral. Canceled.
K	Request referred to an area or to a subject referral library.
M	Material not owned by a specific referral library. The code for the referral library will follow the hyphen.
P	Request filled at referral library. The code for the referral site will follow the hyphen.
PB	Photocopy sent by referral library in lieu of original, as requested. The code for the referral library will follow the hyphen.
S	Material requested not found in the network. Transaction completed.
SN	Not supplied through network. Reserved at State Library.

Note: The State Library has discontinued the use of the term No Report in TWX messages.

A regular schedule of following up unfilled requests has been instituted by the Interlibrary Loan Unit. The request sites will be asked to supply a list of requests which their records indicate are unfilled, on a schedule established by the Interlibrary Loan Unit.